

18/1794



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant : Thomas BRUEMMER  
Serial No. : 10/509,804  
Filed : January 3, 2004  
For : STARCH-BASED BINDING AGENT  
Group Art Unit : 1794  
Examiner : Steven N. Leff

Certificate of Mailing Under 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on March 19, 2008.

Frank J. Jordan  
(Name)

Frank J. Jordan  
(Signature and Date)

03/19/08

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE**

Sir:

In response to the Official Action dated January 31, 2008, and with regard to the requirement for election and restriction, Applicant hereby provisionally elects for the purpose of being completely responsive to the Official Action, should the requirement be made final, the method claims of Group I (Claims 1- 8 and 10-20) but respectfully traverses this restriction requirement.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement are respectfully requested. It is thought that the groups of claims are so directly related to each other that it is believed that all of the claims may properly be included in the same application.

In view of this extent of related subject matter in the claims, it is submitted that the restriction requirement is unwarranted inasmuch as it places an undue burden on Applicant and also on the Patent and Trademark Office in that all of this related subject matter has to be searched at least twice, once for the parent application and once for the Divisional application if such a Divisional application is filed. With regard to this matter, it is pointed out that the notice entitled: "Restrictions Between Inventions" in the May 13, 1975 issue of the Official Gazette (934 O.G. 450)), indicates that "if the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner is encouraged to examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions".

In view of the fact that the claims in question here have related subject matter and in view of the intent expressed in the aforementioned Patent and Trademark Office Notice relating to restriction practice, reconsideration of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested and withdrawal of this restriction is respectfully requested.

It is further noted that the Commissioner of Patents at page 205 of the April 1975 issue of the "JOURNAL OF THE PATENT OFFICE SOCIETY" (Vol. 57), which is a portion of Commissioner Dann's address delivered before the Southwestern Legal Foundation, Dallas, Texas on March 7, 1975, stated as follows:

"The primary consideration in deciding whether to require restriction is one of expediency -- is it simpler for the Office to examine the subject matter in one application or in more than one, having in mind at the same time the additional burdens which may be caused the applicant if restriction is required? The requirement should always take into account the overall effort which will ultimately be spent. In practice I am afraid it is often made simply because the application at hand can be more quickly disposed of if there is restriction. This may work out to cause the Office and the applicant more total effort than if restriction had not been required. We are going to encourage a broader view of this problem."

Should the restriction requirement not be withdrawn, Applicant reserves the right to file a Divisional application at a later date on the non-elected claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and favorable action on the merits of this application are respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests a first one-month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. The fee of \$120.00 for the extension is provided for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038, Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038 is missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Respectfully submitted,

Jordan and Hamburg LLP

By 

Frank J. Jordan  
Reg. No. 20,456  
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340

FJJ/cj  
Enc. Form PTO-2038